

6

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	
09/444,937	11/22/99	MA

MICHAEL HAWES  
BAKER BOTTS LLP  
ONE SHELL PLAZA  
910 LOUISIANA  
HOUSTON TX 77002

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
OFFICE OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
20231

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
66997.0102

DATE MAILED:

NUMBER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

SM

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/444,937

Applicant(s)  
Malda-Smith et al.

Examiner  
Diane Mizrahi

Art Unit  
2171



— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 22, 1999

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application

4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements

## Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 24

20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Diane Mizrahi  
Patent Examiner  
Tech Ctr 2100  
*[Signature]*

Art Unit: 2171

### III. DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kouchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,69 and Kouchi hereinafter) in view of Kennelly et al. (6,101,539 and Kennelly hereinafter).
4. Regarding Claims 1-2, 5, 7 and 19 Kouchi teaches identifying sets of data categories (Abstract) each set corresponding to security data (col 22, lines 23-52) received from one of a plurality of network components (Figure 13, databases 1302a-c); constructing database record definitions each defining a record subdivided in accordance with one of the sets of data categories (col 16, lines 64-67 to col 17, lines 1-5).

Kouchi does not expressly teach writing parser scripts that receive security data from the network components and out

Art Unit: 2171

records, each record corresponding to one for the record definitions and storing parser scripts.

Kennelly teaches writing parser scripts that receive security data from the network components and out records, each record corresponding to one for the record definitions and storing parser scripts (col 6, lines 40-56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Kouchi with the teachings of Kennelly to include writing parser scripts that receive security data from the network components and out records, each record corresponding to one for the record definitions and storing parser scripts with the motivation to allow the users with different privileges access to different functions of the computer system (Kennelly, col 1, lines 20-34).

5. Regarding Claims 3-4, the limitations of these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Kennelly teaches inserting parser scripts into tables (i.e. parses data files based on attributes to construct management objects (col 1, lines 46-48)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the

Art Unit: 2171

teachings of Kouchi with the teachings of Kennelly to include inserting parser scripts into tables with the motivation to allow the users with different privileges access to different functions of the computer system (Kennelly, col 1, lines 20-34).

6. Regarding Claim 6, Kennelly teaches Management Information Base (MIB) (i.e. SNMP MIB) (see publication listings).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Kouchi with the teachings of Kennelly to include Management Information Base (MIB) with the motivation to allow the users with different privileges access to different functions of the computer system (Kennelly, col 1, lines 20-34).

7. Regarding Claim 8, the limitations of these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Kennelly teaches firewall (i.e. by using the Internet) (col 2, lines 52-62).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Kouchi with the teachings of Kennelly to include firewall with the motivation to allow the users with different privileges access to different functions of the computer system (Kennelly, col 1, lines 20-34).

Art Unit: 2171

8. Regarding Claims 9-10, the limitations of these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Kennelly teaches a third network component.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Kouchi with the teachings of Kennelly to include third network component with the motivation to allow the users with different privileges access to different functions of the computer system (Kennelly, col 1, lines 20-34).

9. Regarding Claims 11-12, the limitations of these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Kouchi teaches data queries (col 1, lines 56-66).

10. Regarding Claims 13-18 and 20-26, the limitations of these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

**Joint Inventors**

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant

Art Unit: 2171

is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Other Prior Art Made of Record

12. A. Beelitz et al. (6,182,275) discloses order for a computer system;

B. Freund (5,987,611) discloses managing internet access on a per application basis for client computers;

C. Chappelle (5,949,976) discloses performance monitoring and graphical tool;

D. Polcyn (6,173,437) discloses multimedia scripting tool;

E. Ottensooser (5,905,856) discloses determination of software functionality; and

F. Sharon et al. (6,137,782) discloses an automatic network traffic analysis.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2171


Points of Contact

14. Any inquiry concerning this communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane Mizrahi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 AM. to 5:00 PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (703) 305-9707.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or telefax at our phone number (703) 746-5612.

For formal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT". Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, 6th Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane Mizrahi  
Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100

May 18, 2001